arXiv:1003.5993v1 [cs.DM] 31 Mar 2010

A Triple-Error-Correcting Cyclic Code from the Gold and Kasami-Welch APN Power Functions

Xiangyong Zeng, Jinyong Shan, Lei Hu *†

April 1, 2010

Abstract: Based on a sufficient condition proposed by Hollmann and Xiang for constructing triple-error-correcting codes, the minimum distance of a binary cyclic code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$ with three zeros α, α^3, and α^{13} of length 2^m-1 and the weight divisibility of its dual code are studied, where $m \geq 5$ is odd and α is a primitive element of the finite field $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$. The code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$ is proven to have the same weight distribution as the binary triple-error-correcting primitive BCH code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ of the same length.

Keywords: Cyclic code, BCH code, triple-error-correcting code, minimum distance, almost perfect nonlinear function

1 Introduction

In coding theory, binary triple-error-correcting primitive BCH codes of length $n = 2^m - 1$ are one of the most studied objects [6, 15]. Let α be a primitive element of the finite field $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ with 2^m elements, and for a subset I of $\mathbb{Z}_{2^m-1}$, let $\mathcal{C}_I$ denote the length-n cyclic code with zeros α^i ($i \in I$). The primitive BCH code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ has minimum distance 7, and its weight distribution was discussed in [19, 1, 2, 3]. For some other integers d_1 and d_2 (they are naturally assumed to be different in the sense of cyclotomic equivalence modulo $2^m - 1$ and be different to 1), the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ can also have the same weight distribution as the binary triple-error-correcting primitive BCH code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$. For example, Table 1 lists all known such exponent pairs $\{d_1, d_2\}$ for odd

*X. Zeng and J. Shan are with Faculty of Mathematics and Computer Science, Hubei University, Wuhan 430062, China (e-mail: xiangyongzeng@yahoo.com.cn).

†L. Hu is with the State Key Laboratory of Information Security, Graduate School of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China (e-mail: hu@is.ac.cn).

m, where there exists only one class of exponents with binary weight greater than 2, namely $(2^{\frac{m+1}{2}}+1)^2$ in the construction of [10].

Table 1: Known exponent pairs $\{d_1, d_2\}$ for odd m such that $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ have the same weight distributions

$\{d_1, d_2\}$	condition
$\{2^r+1, 2^{2r}+1\}$	m odd, $\gcd(m,r)=1$ [20]
$\{2^r+1, 2^{3r}+1\}$	m odd, $\gcd(m,r)=1$ [20]
$\{2^{\frac{m-1}{2}}+1, 2^{\frac{m-1}{2}-1}+1\}$	m odd [22]
$\{2^{\frac{m+1}{2}}+1, (2^{\frac{m+1}{2}}+1)^2\}$	m odd [10]

Recently, Hollmann and Xiang [16] proposed a sufficient condition for constructing binary triple-error-correcting codes of length $n=2^m-1$ for odd m. More precisely, if a binary cyclic code $\mathcal{C}$ of length $n=2^m-1$ and dimension $n-3m$ has minimum distance at least 7, and if the weights of all codewords of its dual code $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ are divisible by $2^{\frac{m-1}{2}}$, then $\mathcal{C}$ has the same weight distribution as the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$. For two exponents d_1 and d_2 such that both x^{d_1} and x^{d_2} are almost perfect nonlinear (APN) power functions from $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ to itself, each of the codes $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_2}$ has minimum distance exactly 5 by Theorem 5 of [9] (see also Lemma 1 in Section 2). Notice that $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ is a subcode of both $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_2}$, then $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ has minimum distance at least 5. This motivates us to look for suitable APN power exponents d_1 and d_2 such that $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ has the same weight distribution as $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$.

Table 2: Known values of APN power exponents for odd m

Type	d	condition
Gold	2^r+1	$\gcd(r,m)=1$ [14]
Kasami-Welch	$2^{2r}-2^r+1$	$\gcd(r,m)=1$ [20]
Welch	$2^{\frac{m-1}{2}}+3$	m odd [24]
Niho	$2^{2r}+2^r-1$	$4r\equiv -1 \pmod m$, m odd [24]
Inverse	$2^{m-1}-1$	m odd [4, 25]
Dobbertin	$2^{4r}+2^{3r}+2^{2r}+2^r-1$	$m=5r$, m odd [13]

Following this idea, we experimentally test all known values of APN power exponents (listed in Table 2) for odd integers $m=5$, 7, 9 and 11, to try to find pairs (d_1,d_2) such that $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ have the same weight distributions. By the MacWilliams identity for binary linear codes [22], this is equivalent to say that their dual codes $\mathcal{C}^\perp_{1,d_1,d_2}$ and $\mathcal{C}^\perp_{1,3,5}$ have the same weight

distributions. The weight distribution of $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}^{\perp}$ is given in [19, 22]. The dual code $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}^{\perp}$ is simply given by

$$\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}^{\perp} = \left\{ \mathbf{c}(\epsilon,\gamma,\delta) = \left(\mathrm{Tr}_1^m(\epsilon x + \gamma x^{d_1} + \delta x^{d_2})\right)_{x\in\mathbb{F}_{2^m}^*} \mid \epsilon,\ \gamma,\ \delta \in \mathbb{F}_{2^m} \right\} \tag{1}$$

and its weight distribution is better to compute than that of the target code $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$.

All APN exponent pairs (d_1, d_2) such that $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}^{\perp}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}^{\perp}$ have the same weight distributions in our experiment are listed in Table 3. For odd m and $\gcd(r, m) = 1$, the code $\mathcal{C}_{2^r+1,2^{3r}+1,2^{5r}+1}$ also has the same weight distribution as $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ [20]. This construction and those in Table 1 can explain all pairs $\{d_1, d_2\}$ without the mark $\bigstar$ in Table 3. Notice that we say a pair (d_1, d_2) has actually been explained if $\mathcal{C}_{d,\,2^{i_1}d_1d,\,2^{i_2}d_2d}$ is proven to have the same weight distribution as $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ for three integers i_1, i_2, d with $0 \le i_1, i_2 \le m-1$, $\gcd(d, 2^m-1) = 1$ since $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{d,\,2^{i_1}d_1d,\,2^{i_2}d_2d}$ have the same weight distributions, where the subscripts are taken modulo $2^m - 1$.

Table 3: Exponent pairs (d_1, d_2) such that $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ have the same weight distributions for $m = 5$, 7, 9 and 11

Exponent pair (d_1, d_2)	$m = 5$	$m = 7$	$m = 9$	$m = 11$
(Gold, Gold)	(3,5)	(3,5), (3,9) (5,9)	(3,5), (3,9) (3,17),(5,9) (5,17),(9,17)	(3,5),(3,9),(3,17),(3,33) (5,9),(5,17),(5,33),(9,17) (9,33), (17,33)
(Gold, Kasami-Welch)	$(3, 13)$	$(3, 13)^{\bigstar}$,(9,13)	$(3, 13)^{\bigstar}$	$(3, 13)^{\bigstar}$
(Gold, Welch)	(5,7)	(3,11),$(5, 11)^{\bigstar}$		
(Gold, Niho)	(3,5)			
(Kasami-Welch, Welch)	$(13, 7)$			
(Kasami-Welch, Niho)		$(13, 39)$		

Indeed, we find a new pair marked by $\bigstar$ which can not be explained by known results, where we regard $(5, 11)$ and $(3, 13)$ as a same pair since $\mathcal{C}_{1,5,11}$ has the same weight distribution as $\mathcal{C}_{13,\,2\times5\times13,\,2^3\times11\times13}$, i.e., $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$. It is the Gold exponent $d_1 = 3$ and Kasami-Welch exponent $d_2 = 13$, and the latter is another example of exponents with binary weight 3.

This paper will prove that for any odd integer $m \ge 5$, the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$ has the same weight distribution as $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$. To this end, we use a method developed by Hollmann and Xiang in [16, 17] which analyzes the divisibility of the weights of the codewords in $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}^{\perp}$ by an add-with-carry algorithm and a technical graph-theoretic deduction. In reference [16], Hollmann and Xiang also applied this method to study the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ proposed in [10], where $d_1 = 2^{\frac{m+1}{2}} + 1$ and

$d_2 = (2^{\frac{m+1}{2}} + 1)^2$ are dependent on m. The pair $(3, 13)$ in this paper is independent on m, and this makes the divisibility analysis more complex than that in [16].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives some preliminaries and the results of this paper. Section 3 establishes a lower bound on the minimum distance of the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$. Section 4 discusses the weight divisibility of $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}^{\perp}$. Section 5 concludes the study.

2 Preliminaries and the Results

Let $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}^* = \mathbb{F}_{2^m} \setminus \{0\}$. The trace function Tr_1^m from $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ to $\mathbb{F}_2$ is defined by [21]

$$\mathrm{Tr}_1^m(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x^{2^i}, \ \ x \in \mathbb{F}_{2^m}.$$

A binary cyclic code $\mathcal{C}$ of length n is a principal ideal in the ring $\mathbb{F}_2[x]/(x^n - 1)$. If $g(x)$ is a generator polynomial of $\mathcal{C}$, then a power β of a primitive n-th root of unity is a zero of the code $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if $g(\beta) = 0$. A codeword c in $\mathcal{C}$ has the form as $c_0 + c_1 x + \cdots + c_{n-1}x^{n-1}$, which corresponds to a binary vector $(c_0, c_1, \cdots, c_{n-1})$. The Hamming weight of the codeword c is the number of nonzero c_i for $0 \le i \le n-1$, denoted by $wt(c)$.

Definition 1: A function f from $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ to itself is said to be almost perfect nonlinear (APN) if for each $e \in \mathbb{F}_{2^m}^*$, the function $\Delta_{f,e}(x) = f(x+e) + f(x)$ is two-to-one from $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ to itself.

APN functions were introduced in [25] by Nyberg to define them as the mappings with highest resistance to differential cryptanalysis. For more details we refer the reader to [4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 25] and the references therein.

For a function f from $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ to itself with $f(0) = 0$, let $\mathcal{C}_f$ denote the binary cyclic code of length $n = 2^m - 1$ with parity check matrix

$$H_f = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha & \alpha^2 & \cdots & \alpha^{2^n-2} \\ f(1) & f(\alpha) & f(\alpha^2) & \cdots & f(\alpha^{2^n-2}) \end{pmatrix}$$

where each entry is viewed as a binary column vector basing on a basis expression of elements of $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ over $\mathbb{F}_2$.

The APN properties of f can be characterized by the minimum distance of $\mathcal{C}_f$ [9].

Lemma 1: ([9]) The code $\mathcal{C}_f$ has minimum distance 5 if and only if f is APN.

Since the 1960s, the family of triple-error-correcting binary primitive BCH codes of length $n = 2^m - 1$ has been thoroughly studied. The following lemma given by Hollmann and Xiang presented a sufficient condition for constructing families of triple-error-correcting codes.

Lemma 2: ([16]) Let m be odd and $\mathcal{C}$ be a binary cyclic code of length $n = 2^m - 1$, dimension $n - 3m$ and minimum distance at least 7. If all weights of the codewords in $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}$ are divisible by $2^{\frac{m-1}{2}}$, then $\mathcal{C}$ has the same weight distribution as $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$.

With Lemma 2, for odd m, we can construct binary triple-error-correcting codes of length $n = 2^m - 1$ and dimension $n - 3m$ by analyzing their minimum distances and weight divisibility of their dual codes. The following Proposition 1 will be proven in the next section, and the following Lemma 3 shows that the product of the nonzeros of a binary cyclic code can be used to analyze the weight divisibility.

Proposition 1: For odd $m \geq 5$, the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$ has minimum distance at least 7.

Lemma 3: ([23]) Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a binary cyclic code, and let l be the smallest positive integer such that l nonzeros of $\mathcal{C}$ (with repetitions allowed) have product 1. Then the weight of every codeword in $\mathcal{C}$ is divisible by 2^{l-1}, and there is at least one codeword whose weight is not divisible by 2^l.

Based on Lemma 3, Hollmann and Xiang presented an add-with-carry algorithm to obtain information on the largest power of 2 dividing the weights of all codewords of a binary cyclic code as below [16, 17].

For a positive integer m and a non-negative integer a with the binary expression $a = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i 2^i$, $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$, the (binary) weight $w(a)$ of a is defined as the integer $w(a) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i$. For d_1, d_2, $\cdots$, $d_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{2^m-1}$, define

$$M(m; d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_j) = \max \left(w(s) - \sum_{l=1}^{j} w(a^{(l)}) \right)$$

where the maximum is taken over all integers s, $a^{(1)}$, $\cdots$, $a^{(j)}$ satisfying

$$0 \leq s, a^{(1)}, \cdots, a^{(j)} \leq 2^m - 1,\ s \equiv \sum_{l=1}^{j} d_l a^{(l)} \pmod{2^m - 1} \text{ and } a^{(l)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2^m - 1} \text{ for some } l.$$

The add-with-carry algorithm for integers modulo $2^m - 1$ can be used to determine $M(m; d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_j)$ [16, 17].

Let $a^{(l)}$ and s have binary expressions

$$a^{(l)} = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i^{(l)} 2^i \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq j \text{ and } s = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} s_i 2^i, \tag{2}$$

respectively. Furthermore, let d_1, d_2, $\cdots$, d_j be nonzero integers, and define $d_+ = \sum_{d_l > 0} d_l$ and

$d_- = \sum_{d_l<0} d_l$ so that $\sum_{l=1}^{j} d_l = d_+ + d_-,\ \ d_+ \geq 0,\ d_- \leq 0$, and suppose that $s \equiv d_1 a^{(1)} + d_2 a^{(2)} + \cdots + d_j a^{(j)} \pmod{2^m - 1}$.

Lemma 4: ([16, 17]) There exists a unique integer sequence $c_{-1}, c_0, \ldots, c_{m-1}$ with $c_{-1} = c_{m-1}$ such that

$$2c_i + s_i = \sum_{l=1}^{j} d_l a_i^{(l)} + c_{i-1}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq m-1 \tag{3}$$

holds. Moreover, with notation $w(c) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} c_i$, we have that

$$w(c) = \sum_{l=1}^{j} d_l w(a^{(l)}) - w(s).$$

The numbers c_i satisfy $d_- - 1 \leq c_i \leq d_+$, and further

$$d_- \leq c_i < d_+$$

for all i if $a^{(l)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2^m - 1}$ holds for some l.

The integers s_i and c_i are called the *digits* and *carries* for the computation of s modulo $2^m - 1$ in terms of $a^{(1)}, \cdots, a^{(j)}, d_1, \cdots, d_j$.

Lemma 5: ([16, 17]) All the weights of $\mathcal{C}^{\perp}_{1,d_1,d_2}$ are divisible by $2^{m-M(m;d_1,d_2)-1}$, and there is at least one codeword whose weight is not divisible by $2^{m-M(m;d_1,d_2)}$.

The following proposition will be proven in Section 4.

Proposition 2: $M(m; 3, 13) = (m-1)/2$.

By Propositions 1 and 2 and Lemmas 2 and 5, we obtain the following theorem as the main result in this paper.

Theorem 1: For any odd integer $m \geq 5$, the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$ has the same weight distribution as the binary triple-error-correcting primitive BCH code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$.

3 Minimum Distance of $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$

Proof of Proposition 1: Let $c = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{n-1})$ be an arbitrary codeword in $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$, where $n = 2^m - 1$. The Discrete Fourier Transform of c is the sequence $\{A_\lambda\}$ with

$$A_\lambda = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_i \alpha^{i\lambda}, \quad 0 \leq \lambda < n.$$

From the above formula, we have that n is a period of the sequence $\{A_\lambda\}$. If $A_5 = 0$, then c is a codeword of the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ which has minimum distance 7 [20]. This shows $wt(c) \geq 7$. If $A_9 = 0$, then c is a codeword of the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,9}$ which also has minimum distance 7 [20]. Consequently, $wt(c) \geq 7$. Thus we can assume that $A_5 A_9 \neq 0$ in the following analysis.

By [26], the Hamming weight of c equals to the linear complexity (also called linear span) of the sequence $\{A_\lambda\}$. It is sufficient to prove that the rank of M is at least 7, where

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & A_1 & \cdots & A_{n-1} \\ A_1 & A_2 & \cdots & A_0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ A_{n-1} & A_0 & \cdots & A_{n-2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

To this end, we will argue separately according to the parity of $wt(c)$.

(1) Suppose that $wt(c)$ is odd, i.e., $A_0 = 1$.

In this case, we will find two submatrices M_1 and M_2 of M such that either M_1 or M_2 has full rank, where

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & A_1 & A_2 & A_4 & A_6 & A_8 \\ A_1 & A_2 & A_3 & A_5 & A_7 & A_9 \\ A_2 & A_3 & A_4 & A_6 & A_8 & A_{10} \\ A_3 & A_4 & A_5 & A_7 & A_9 & A_{11} \\ A_5 & A_6 & A_7 & A_9 & A_{11} & A_{13} \\ A_6 & A_7 & A_8 & A_{10} & A_{12} & A_{14} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & A_1 & A_3 & A_4 & A_7 & A_8 \\ A_1 & A_2 & A_4 & A_5 & A_8 & A_9 \\ A_2 & A_3 & A_5 & A_6 & A_9 & A_{10} \\ A_3 & A_4 & A_6 & A_7 & A_{10} & A_{11} \\ A_4 & A_5 & A_7 & A_8 & A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_5 & A_6 & A_8 & A_9 & A_{12} & A_{13} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Notice that $A_\lambda = 0$ if $\lambda \in C_1 \cup C_3 \cup C_{13}$, where C_i denotes the cyclotomic coset modulo $2^m - 1$ containing the integer i. Consequently, we have $A_1 = A_2 = A_3 = A_4 = A_6 = A_8 = A_{12} = A_{13} = 0$. From the expression of A_λ, we have $A_{10} = A_5^2$, $A_{14} = A_7^2$ and $A_{18} = A_9^2$.

It can be directly verified that

$$\det(M_1) = A_5^2 A_7 (A_7^3 + A_5^2 A_{11}) \quad \text{and} \quad \det(M_2) = A_5^2 (A_5^2 A_9^2 + A_5 A_9 A_7^2 + A_5^2 A_7 A_{11}).$$

If $A_7 = 0$, then $\det(M_2) = A_5^4 A_9^2 \neq 0$ by our assumption that $A_5 A_9 \neq 0$, i.e., $\mathrm{rank}(M_2) = 6$. If $A_7 \neq 0$ and $A_{11} = 0$, then $\det(M_1) \neq 0$ by $A_5 A_7 \neq 0$, i.e., M_1 has rank 6. If $A_7 \neq 0$, $A_{11} \neq 0$ and $\det(M_1) = 0$, then $A_7^3 = A_5^2 A_{11}$. Thus,

$$\det(M_2) = A_5^2 (A_5^2 A_9^2 + A_5 A_9 A_7^2 + A_7^4), \tag{5}$$

which is either $A_5^3 A_9 A_7^2 \neq 0$ if $A_5 A_9 = A_7^2$ or

$$A_5^2 (A_5 A_9 + A_7^2)^{-1} \Big[(A_5 A_9)^3 + (A_7^2)^3 \Big] \neq 0$$

since $\gcd(3, n) = 1$ if $A_5 A_9 \neq A_7^2$. Therefore, either M_1 or M_2 has full rank, and then $\text{rank}(M) \geq 6$. As a consequence, $wt(c) \geq 7$.

(2) Suppose that $wt(c)$ is even, i.e., $A_0 = 0$.

If $A_7 = 0$, we will prove the following submatrix

$$M_3 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & A_1 & A_2 & A_4 & A_5 & A_6 & A_8 \\ A_1 & A_2 & A_3 & A_5 & A_6 & A_7 & A_9 \\ A_2 & A_3 & A_4 & A_6 & A_7 & A_8 & A_{10} \\ A_4 & A_5 & A_6 & A_8 & A_9 & A_{10} & A_{12} \\ A_5 & A_6 & A_7 & A_9 & A_{10} & A_{11} & A_{13} \\ A_7 & A_8 & A_9 & A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} & A_{15} \\ A_8 & A_9 & A_{10} & A_{12} & A_{13} & A_{14} & A_{16} \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank 7. By a direct calculation, we have $\det(M_3) = A_5^7 A_9^2 \neq 0$. Thus $\text{rank}(M_3) \geq 7$ which implies that $wt(c) \geq 7$.

If $A_7 \neq 0$, we will prove the submatrix

$$M_4 = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & A_1 & A_2 & A_4 & A_6 & A_7 & A_8 \\ A_1 & A_2 & A_3 & A_5 & A_7 & A_8 & A_9 \\ A_2 & A_3 & A_4 & A_6 & A_8 & A_9 & A_{10} \\ A_4 & A_5 & A_6 & A_8 & A_{10} & A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_5 & A_6 & A_7 & A_9 & A_{11} & A_{12} & A_{13} \\ A_8 & A_9 & A_{10} & A_{12} & A_{14} & A_{15} & A_{16} \\ A_{12} & A_{13} & A_{14} & A_{16} & A_{18} & A_{19} & A_{20} \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank 7. By a direct calculation, we have $\det(M_4) = A_5^5 A_7 (A_5^2 A_9^2 + A_5 A_9 A_7^2 + A_7^4)$. With a similar analysis as for (5), we have $\det(M_4) \neq 0$ and then $\text{rank}(M) \geq 7$. Thus, $wt(c) \geq 7$. ■

Remark 1: The reference [26] showed that the minimum distance of a linear cyclic code is equal to the rank of a matrix constructed by using Discrete Fourier Transform. This together with BCH or HT bound established a lower bound on the minimum distance of the code proposed in [10]. In Proposition 1, we apply this method and the results for the minimum distances of the cyclic codes $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,5}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,9}$ [20] to obtain a lower bound on minimum distance of $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$.

4 Divisibility of Weights in $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}^{\perp}$

In this section, for an odd integer $m = 2k + 1$ with $k \geq 2$, we will prove $M(m; 3, 13) = k$.

Let s, a and b be integers with $0 \le s,\, a,\, b \le 2^m-1$, $s \equiv 3a+13b \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 2^m-1)$, and assume that at least one of a and b is nonzero modulo 2^m-1. Let $s=\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} s_i 2^i$, $a=\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} a_i 2^i$, and $b=\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} b_i 2^i$ be the binary expressions of s, a and b, respectively.

We first prove $M(m;3,13) \le k$, namely $w(s)-w(a)-w(b) \le k$ in the sequel.

Notice that $2a,\ 8b,\ 4b \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 2^m-1)$ have the binary expressions $\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} a_{i-1}2^i$, $\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} b_{i-3}2^i$, $\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} b_{i-2}2^i$, respectively, and $s \equiv 3a+13b \equiv 2a+a+8b+4b+b \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 2^m-1)$. Taking $d_l=1$ for $l \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$ and $a^{(1)}=2a$, $a^{(2)}=a$, $a^{(3)}=8b$, $a^{(4)}=4b$, $a^{(5)}=b$ and applying Lemma 4, there are carries $c_i \in \{0,1,2,3,4\}$ such that

$$2c_i+s_i = a_{i-1}+a_i+b_{i-3}+b_{i-2}+b_i+c_{i-1},\ \ 0 \le i \le m-1, \tag{6}$$

where the subscripts are taken modulo m. With $w(c)=\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} c_i$, by the m equalities in (6) we have

$$w(c)+w(s) = 2w(a)+3w(b). \tag{7}$$

Let

$$\nu_i = a_{i-1}+a_i+b_{i-3}+b_{i-2}+b_{i-1}+b_i-c_{i-1}-c_i,\ \ 0 \le i \le m-1 \tag{8}$$

and $w(\nu)=\sum\limits_{i=0}^{m-1} \nu_i$. Then by (8) and (7), we have

$$w(\nu) = 2w(a)+4w(b)-2w(c) = 2\big(w(s)-w(a)-w(b)\big). \tag{9}$$

To prove $w(s)-w(a)-w(b) \le k$, by (9) it is sufficient to prove $w(\nu) \le m$. To this end, we will define a certain weighted directed graph $\mathbb{D}$ and recall some related definitions in [5] as below.

A *directed graph* $\mathbb{D}$ is an ordered pair $(V(\mathbb{D}), A(\mathbb{D}))$ consisting of a set $V(\mathbb{D})$ of vertices and a set $A(\mathbb{D})$, disjoint from $V(\mathbb{D})$, of *arcs*, together with an *incidence function* $\psi_{\mathbb{D}}$ that associates with each arc ϑ of $\mathbb{D}$ an ordered pair of (not necessarily distinct) vertices $\psi_{\mathbb{D}}(\vartheta)=(T(\vartheta),H(\vartheta))$ of $\mathbb{D}$. The vertex $T(\vartheta)$ is the *tail* of ϑ, and the vertex $H(\vartheta)$ its *head*. For each arc ϑ in a directed graph $\mathbb{D}$, we can associate a real number $w(\vartheta)$ with ϑ, and $w(\vartheta)$ is called its *weight*. In this case, $\mathbb{D}$ is called to be a *weighted directed graph*. In a directed graph $\mathbb{D}$, a *directed walk* is an alternating sequence of vertices and arcs

$$W := P_0\vartheta_0P_1\cdots P_{l-1}\vartheta_{l-1}P_l$$

such that for each i with $1 \leq i \leq l$, P_{i-1} and P_i are the tail and head of ϑ_{i-1}, respectively. In this case, we refer to W as a *directed* (P_0, P_l)*-walk*. For two vertices P_i and P_j in the walk W where $0 \leq i < j \leq l$, the (P_i, P_j)*-segment* of W is the subsequence of W starting with P_i and ending with P_j, and it is denoted P_iWP_j. The directed walk W in $\mathbb{D}$ is *closed* if its initial and terminal vertices P_0, P_l are identical.

With these preparations, we can define a weighted directed graph $\mathbb{D}$. The vertices of $\mathbb{D}$ consist of all vectors $P = (x, y, z, u)$, where $x, y, z \in \{0, 1\}$ and $u \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. Let $P_1 = (x_1, y_1, z_1, u_1)$ and $P_2 = (x_2, y_2, z_2, u_2)$ be two vertices of $\mathbb{D}$, and define an arc ϑ with $T(\vartheta) = P_1$ and $H(\vartheta) = P_2$ if

$$x_1 + y_1 + z_1 + x_2 + z_2 - 2u_1 + u_2 = 0, \text{ or } 1. \tag{10}$$

The weight of the arc ϑ is defined as

$$w(\vartheta) = x_1 + y_1 + z_1 + x_2 + y_2 + z_2 - u_1 - u_2.$$

Thus for $i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, m-1\}$,

$$V_i = (a_i, b_i, b_{i-2}, c_i) \tag{11}$$

are m vertices of $\mathbb{D}$, where a_i, b_i, and c_i are those integers in (6). Furthermore, there are m arcs ϑ_i with $w(\vartheta_i) = \nu_i$ defined by (8) with the tail $V_i = (a_i, b_i, b_{i-2}, c_i)$ and head $V_{i-1} = (a_{i-1}, b_{i-1}, b_{i-3}, c_{i-1})$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m-1$ since $a_i+b_i+b_{i-2}+a_{i-1}+b_{i-3}-2c_i+c_{i-1} = s_i \in \{0, 1\}$ by (6), where the subscripts are taken modulo m.

With the help of a computer, we have that there are totally 320 arcs in $\mathbb{D}$, and their weight distribution is given in Table 4. Furthermore, every vertex in the set

$$\Gamma = \Big\{(1, 1, 0, 0), (1, 0, 1, 0), (0, 1, 1, 0), (1, 1, 1, 0)\Big\} \tag{12}$$

cannot be the tail of any arc in $\mathbb{D}$. Some arcs ϑ with head $H(\vartheta) \notin \Gamma$ will be used in this section and they are listed in Appendix A.

Table 4: The weight distribution of all arcs in the weighted directed graph $\mathbb{D}$

Weight	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	4
The number of arcs	1	16	36	43	43	42	43	43	36	16	1

Notice that for the case $\nu_i < 2$ for all $i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, m-1\}$, it can be easily verified that $w(\nu) \leq m$. Consequently, the proof for $w(\nu) \leq m$ can be proceeded in two steps as below.

Step 1: To prove that for any $\nu_i \geq 2$, there exists a positive integer $t \leq m$ such that $\nu_i + \nu_{i-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i-t+1} \leq t$.

Step 2: Based on Step 1, we will prove $w(\nu) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \nu_i \leq m$.

The two steps are summarized as the following Propositions 3 and 4.

Proposition 3: For any $\nu_i \geq 2$, there exists a positive integer $t \leq m$ such that $\nu_i + \nu_{i-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i-t+1} \leq t$, where the subscripts are taken modulo m.

By the weighted directed graph $\mathbb{D}$ defined as above, the number $\nu_i + \nu_{i-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i-t+1}$ can be regarded as the sum of the weights of some arcs in $\mathbb{D}$. To finish the proof of Proposition 3, we need to study a set

$$\mathcal{P} = \Big\{ W = P_0\vartheta_0 P_1\vartheta_1 \cdots P_{i-1}\vartheta_{i-1}P_i\vartheta_i \cdots P_{q-1}\vartheta_{q-1}P_q \,|\, W \in \mathbb{D},\, q \,\text{is dependent on}\, W \Big\} \tag{13}$$

consisting of all directed walks W with the following properties:

(I) any vertex of the set Γ in (12) does not occur in W;

(II) for $0 \leq i \leq q-2$, any three consecutive vertices P_i, P_{i+1}, and P_{i+2} in W satisfy $P_i(3) = P_{i+2}(2)$, where $P_i(l)$ denotes the l-th component of P_i for $l \in \{1,2,3,4\}$; in addition, if the walk W is closed, then $P_{q-1}(3) = P_1(2)$;

(III) any arc ϑ_i in W satisfies that $w(\vartheta_i) \geq (i+2) - T_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq q-1$, where $T_0 = 0$ and $T_i = \sum_{l=0}^{i-1} w(\vartheta_l)$ for $i \geq 1$.

If Proposition 3 cannot be true, then there is an integer i_0 with $0 \leq i_0 \leq m-1$ such that $\nu_{i_0} \geq 2$ and $\nu_{i_0} + \nu_{i_0-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i_0-t+1} \geq t+1$ for any positive integer t with $2 \leq t \leq m$. Let

$$W_0 = P_0\vartheta_0 P_1\vartheta_1 \cdots P_{i-1}\vartheta_{i-1}P_i\vartheta_i \cdots P_{m-2}\vartheta_{m-2}P_{m-1} \tag{14}$$

be the walk such that $P_i = V_{i_0-i}$ in (11) for $0 \leq i \leq m-1$, and ϑ_i be the arc with $T(\vartheta_i) = P_i$ and $H(\vartheta_i) = P_{i+1}$ for $i \in \{0,1,\cdots,m-1\}$, where the subscripts are taken modulo m. Then, we have $w(\vartheta_0) \geq 2$ and for any positive integer t with $2 \leq t \leq m$ such that $w(\vartheta_0)+w(\vartheta_1)+\cdots+w(\vartheta_{t-1}) \geq t+1$. Thus by (11) and the analysis therein, $W_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ and it is closed. As a consequence, it will lead to a contradiction if any walk $W \in \mathcal{P}$ is not closed. In fact, we can prove that any walk $W \in \mathcal{P}$ is not closed in the sequel. This will give the proof of Proposition 3.

The following notations are used throughout this section:

- $P_i \xrightarrow{(\eta,\omega)}$ denotes any walk $P_i\vartheta_i P_{i+1}$ with $T(\vartheta_i) = P_i$, $H(\vartheta_i) = P_{i+1}$, $P_{i+1}(2) = \eta$ and $w(\vartheta_i) \geq \omega$;
- $P_i \xrightarrow{(-,\omega)}$ denotes any walk $P_i\vartheta_i P_{i+1}$ with $T(\vartheta_i) = P_i$, $H(\vartheta_i) = P_{i+1}$, $P_{i+1}(2) \in \{0,1\}$ and $w(\vartheta_i) \geq \omega$;

- $P_i \xrightarrow{(\eta,\omega)} O$ denotes that there does not exist any arc ϑ such that $T(\vartheta) = P_i$, $H(\vartheta) \in \mathbb{D}$, $(H(\vartheta))(2) = \eta$ and $w(\vartheta) \geq \omega$.

With the above notations, we can conveniently describe the walks in $\mathcal{P}$.

Example 1: Let q be a positive integer and $\omega = (j+2) - T_j = 1$ for some positive integer j with $0 \leq j < q$, and let

$$W: \ P_0 \to P_1 \to \cdots \to P_{j-1} \to P_j = (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\omega)} P_{j+1} \to P_{j+2} \to \cdots \to P_q$$

be a walk in the set $\mathcal{P}$, and ϑ_i be the arc with the tail P_i and head P_{i+1} for each $i \in \{0,1,\cdots,q-1\}$. By Appendix A, we can find all possibilities for the segment $P_{j+1}WP_q$, which is completely determined by the walk $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$.

If we find all possibilities for the segment $P_{j+1}WP_q$, then we also know all possibilities for the segment $P_{j+1}WP_{q'}$ for any integer $j+1 \leq q' \leq q$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we can assume that the integer q is large enough.

Since $P_{j+1}(2) = 0$ and $w(\vartheta_j) \geq 1$, by Appendix A, we have $P_{j+1} \in \big\{(1,0,0,0),(0,0,1,0)\big\}$. If $P_{j+1} = (1,0,0,0)$, by Properties (II) and (III) of the walks in $\mathcal{P}$, we have $P_{j+2}(2) = P_j(3) = 0$ and $w(\vartheta_{j+1}) \geq (j+3) - T_{j+1} = (j+3) - w(\vartheta_j) - T_j = (j+2) - w(\vartheta_j) - T_j = 1$. By Appendix A, we can uniquely determine $P_{j+2} = (0,0,0,0)$. Furthermore, with $w(\vartheta_{j+1}) = 1$ and $P_{j+1} = (1,0,0,0)$, we have

$$w(\vartheta_{j+2}) \geq (j+4) - T_{j+2} = (j+4) - w(\vartheta_{j+1}) - T_{j+1} = (j+3) - T_{j+1} = 1 \tag{15}$$

and $P_{j+3}(2) = 0$. Therefore, for $P_{j+1} = (1,0,0,0)$, P_jWP_{j+3} can be expressed as

$$(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} . \tag{16}$$

Similarly, for $P_{j+1} = (0,0,1,0)$, P_jWP_{j+5} is given by

$$(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} . \tag{17}$$

Combining (16) and (17), we have an expression consisting of two segments with initial vertex P_j

$$(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} . \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

In the first segment of (18), $P_{j+3} = (1,0,0,0)$ or $(0,0,1,0)$ since $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ has only two possible forms, which have occurred as P_jWP_{j+1} in the first and second segments of (18),

respectively. By a similar analysis, we have $P_{j+5} = (1,0,0,0)$ or $(0,0,1,0)$ in the second segment of (18). Therefore, again by (18), we have that $P_{j+3}WP_{j+5}$ has the form as

$$(1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \tag{19}$$

or $P_{j+3}WP_{j+7}$ has the form as

$$(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \tag{20}$$

in the first segment of (18). Similarly, we have that $P_{j+5}WP_{j+7}$ has the form as (19) or $P_{j+5}WP_{j+9}$ has the form as (20) in the second segment of (18). Repeating the above process, all possibilities of $P_{j+1}WP_q$ can be obtained. Further, all vertices P_l $(j \le l \le q)$ have occurred in the two segments of (18), and they are $(0,0,0,0)$, $(1,0,0,0)$, $(0,1,0,0)$, and $(0,0,1,0)$.

Remark 2: In Example 1, $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ completely determines all possibilities for the segment $P_{j+1}WP_q$ of W. The expression (18) consists of two basic segments of W, by which all possibilities of the segment $P_{j+1}WP_q$ can be conveniently found. In the proofs of Lemmas 6 and 7, for some given $P_j \xrightarrow{(\eta,\omega)}$ of a walk W in $\mathcal{P}$, we will frequently need to determine all possibilities for the segment $P_{j+1}WP_q$ of W. Similarly as in Example 1, we will use some expression consisting of basic segments of W to determine all possibilities of $P_{j+1}WP_q$. We call the expression as (18) *a set of basic segments* (SBS) of $P_j \xrightarrow{(\eta,\omega)}$.

The following two lemmas will be used to prove Proposition 3.

Lemma 6: Let q be a positive integer and $\omega = (j+2) - T_j$ for some positive integer j with $0 \le j < q$. For any walk

$$W: \ P_0 \to P_1 \to \cdots \to P_{j-1} \to P_j = (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(-,\omega)} P_{j+1} \to \cdots \to P_{q-1} \to P_q$$

in the set $\mathcal{P}$ defined by (13), we have

(i) if $\omega = 0$ or 1, all vertices P_l $(j+1 \le l \le q)$ occurring in the walk W are contained in the set

$$S_1 = \Big\{(0,0,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(0,1,0,0),(1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,1)\Big\}; \tag{21}$$

(ii) if $\omega = -1$, all vertices P_l $(j+1 \le l \le q)$ occurring in the walk W are contained in the set

$$S_2 = S_1 \bigcup \Big\{(0,0,0,1),(0,0,1,1),(1,0,0,1)\Big\}; \tag{22}$$

(iii) if $\omega = -2$, all vertices P_l $(j+1 \le l \le q)$ occurring in the walk W are contained in the set

$$S_3 = S_2 \bigcup \Big\{(1,0,1,1),(0,1,1,1),(1,1,0,1)\Big\}. \tag{23}$$

The proof of Lemma 6 is presented in Appendix B.

Lemma 7: For the walk

$$W: \ P_0 \to P_1 \to \cdots \to P_{q-1} \to P_q$$

in the set $\mathcal{P}$, if the initial vertex $P_0 \in \big\{(1,0,0,0),(0,1,0,0),(0,0,1,0),(1,0,1,1),(1,1,0,1),(0,1,1,1)\big\}$, then W cannot be closed.

Proof: Let ϑ_j denote the arc with the tail P_j and head P_{j+1} for each $j \in \{0,1,\cdots,q-1\}$. Since $W \in \mathcal{P}$, by Property (III) of the walks in $\mathcal{P}$, we have $w(\vartheta_0) \geq 2$. If W is closed, then we must have $P_q = P_0$ and $P_{q-1}(3) = P_1(2)$. The lemma is proven according to six cases of the vertex P_0 as follows.

If $P_0 = (1,0,0,0)$ and $w(\vartheta_0) \geq 2$, then $P_1 = (0,1,0,0)$ by Appendix A. Consequently, $P_2(2) = 0$ and by Property (III) of the walks in $\mathcal{P}$, $w(\vartheta_1) \geq 1$. By a similar analysis as in Example 1, $(0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

From (24), we can know that all vertices and arcs in $P_1 W P_q$ have occurred in (24). If $P_q = P_0 = (1,0,0,0)$, then by (24), $P_{q-1} = (0,0,0,0)$ and then $P_{q-1}(3) = 0 \neq P_1(2)$. Therefore the walk W cannot be closed if $P_0 = (1,0,0,0)$.

The case $P_0 = (0,1,0,0)$ can be similarly proven as the case $P_0 = (1,0,0,0)$.

If $P_0 = (0,0,1,0)$, then $P_0 W P_4$ has the form as

$$(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(-,2)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)}. \tag{25}$$

If W is closed, then $P_q = (0,0,1,0)$ and $P_{q-1}(3) = 1$. By (25), we have $q \geq 5$. By Lemma 6 (i), the vertices P_j for $4 \leq j \leq q$ in W are contained in S_1. Consequently, $P_{q-1} \in S_1$. Notice that $(0,0,1,0)$ is the unique vertex with the third component 1 in the set S_1. As a consequence, $P_{q-1} = (0,0,1,0)$ and the arc ϑ_{q-1} is $(0,0,1,0) \to (0,0,1,0)$, which does not exist by Appendix A. This leads to a contradiction and then W cannot be closed.

If $P_0 = (1,0,1,1)$, then $(1,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(-,2)}$ has an SBS as

$$(1,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(-,2)} \begin{cases} (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \\ (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}. \end{cases} \tag{26}$$

The vertices P_j for $4 \leq j \leq q$ of the first and second segments of (26) are contained in S_1 and the vertices P_j for $5 \leq j \leq q$ of the third segment in (26) are contained in S_2 by Lemma 6 (i) and (ii). Notice that $(1,0,1,1) \notin S_1$ and $(1,0,1,1) \notin S_2$. Consequently, the walk W cannot be closed.

If $P_0 = (1,1,0,1)$, then P_0WP_3 has three possible forms as

$$(1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(-,2)} \begin{cases} (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} . \end{cases}$$

The vertices P_j for $3 \leq j \leq q$ are contained in S_1 by Lemma 6 (i). The fact $(1,1,0,1) \notin S_1$ implies that W cannot be closed.

The case $P_0 = (0,1,1,1)$ can be similarly proven as the case $P_0 = (1,0,1,1)$.

The proof is finished. ■

Applying Lemmas 6 and 7, we will finish the proof of Proposition 3 as below.

Proof of Proposition 3: If the result is not true, the walk W_0 defined in (14) belongs to the set $\mathcal{P}$ and $w(\vartheta_0) \geq 2$. We will prove that W_0 cannot be closed according to ϑ_0.

Notice that there are no arcs ϑ with tail $T(\vartheta) \in \Gamma$, where Γ is defined by (12). As a consequence, W_0 cannot be closed if ϑ_0 occurs in Table 5.

Table 5: All arcs ϑ with $w(\vartheta) \geq 2$ and $H(\vartheta) \in \Gamma$

$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$	$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$	$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$
(0,0,0,0)	(1,1,0,0)	2	(0,0,0,0)	(0,1,1,0)	2	(0,0,0,1)	(1,1,1,0)	2
(1,0,0,1)	(1,1,0,0)	2	(1,0,0,1)	(1,0,1,0)	2	(1,0,0,1)	(0,1,1,0)	2
(1,0,0,1)	(1,1,1,0)	3	(0,1,0,1)	(1,1,0,0)	2	(0,1,0,1)	(1,0,1,0)	2
(0,1,0,1)	(0,1,1,0)	2	(0,1,0,1)	(1,1,1,0)	3	(1,1,0,1)	(1,1,0,0)	3
(1,1,0,1)	(0,1,1,0)	3	(1,1,0,2)	(1,0,1,0)	2	(1,1,0,2)	(1,1,1,0)	3
(0,0,1,1)	(1,1,0,0)	2	(0,0,1,1)	(1,0,1,0)	2	(0,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,0)	2
(0,0,1,1)	(1,1,1,0)	3	(1,0,1,1)	(1,1,0,0)	3	(1,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,0)	3
(1,0,1,2)	(1,0,1,0)	2	(1,0,1,2)	(1,1,1,0)	3	(0,1,1,1)	(1,1,0,0)	3
(0,1,1,1)	(0,1,1,0)	3	(0,1,1,2)	(1,0,1,0)	2	(0,1,1,2)	(1,1,1,0)	3
(1,1,1,2)	(1,1,0,0)	3	(1,1,1,2)	(1,0,1,0)	3	(1,1,1,2)	(0,1,1,0)	3
(1,1,1,2)	(1,1,1,0)	4						

We list all arcs ϑ with $w(\vartheta) \geq 2$, $T(\vartheta) \notin S_3$ and $H(\vartheta) \notin \Gamma$ in Table 6, where S_3 is defined

by (23).

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,1,0,2) \to (1,1,1,1)$ in Table 6, by Appendix A, $P_0W_0P_3$ has the form as

$$(1,1,0,2) \to (1,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} .$$

The vertices P_j for $j \geq 3$ are contained in S_1 by Lemma 6 (i). Notice that $(1,1,0,2) \notin S_1$. Consequently, W_0 cannot be closed.

Table 6: All arcs ϑ with $w(\vartheta) \geq 2$, $T(\vartheta) \notin S_3$ and $H(\vartheta) \notin \Gamma$

$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$	$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$	$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$
(1,1,0,2)	(1,1,1,1)	2	(1,0,1,2)	(1,1,1,1)	2	(0,1,1,2)	(1,1,1,1)	2
(1,1,1,3)	(1,1,1,1)	2	(1,1,1,1)	(0,0,0,0)	2	(1,1,1,1)	(0,1,0,0)	3
(1,1,1,2)	(1,1,0,1)	2	(1,1,1,2)	(0,1,1,1)	2	(1,1,1,2)	(1,0,0,0)	2
(1,1,1,2)	(0,0,1,0)	2						

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,0,1,2) \to (1,1,1,1)$ in Table 6, $P_0W_0P_5$ has the form as

$$(1,0,1,2) \to (1,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,-1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} .$$

The vertices P_j for $j \geq 5$ are contained in S_3 by Lemma 6 (iii). Therefore, W_0 cannot be closed since $(1,0,1,2) \notin S_3$. The cases for the arcs $(0,1,1,2) \to (1,1,1,1)$ and $(1,1,1,3) \to (1,1,1,1)$ in Table 6 can be similarly proven.

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,1,1,1) \to (0,0,0,0)$ in Table 6, then $P_0W_0P_2$ has the form as $(1,1,1,1) \to (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)}$. Thus, all vertices P_j for $j \geq 2$ are contained in S_1 by Lemma 6 (i), and then W_0 cannot be closed since $(1,1,1,1) \notin S_1$.

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,1,1,1) \to (0,1,0,0)$ in Table 6, $P_0W_0P_4$ has the form as

$$(1,1,1,1) \to (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)},$$

and the vertices P_j for $j \geq 4$ are contained in S_2 by Lemma 6 (ii). So W_0 cannot be closed since $(1,1,1,1) \notin S_2$.

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,1,1,2) \to (1,1,0,1)$ in Table 6, $(1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \\ (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

and then the vertices P_j for $j \geq 4$ are contained in S_1 by Lemma 6 (i). Thus W_0 cannot be closed since $(1,1,1,2) \notin S_1$.

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,1,1,2) \to (0,1,1,1)$ in Table 6, $(0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} \\ (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} . \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

The walks $(0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ and $(1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ have been analyzed in (35) and (36) in Appendix B, respectively. Thus by Lemma 6, the vertices P_j for $j \geq 1$ are contained in S_3. So W_0 cannot be closed since $(1,1,1,2) \notin S_3$.

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,1,1,2) \to (1,0,0,0)$ in Table 6, $P_0W_0P_4$ has the form as

$$(1,1,1,2) \to (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)},$$

and the vertices P_4 for $j \geq 4$ are contained in S_1 by Lemma 6 (i). So W_0 cannot be closed since $(1,1,1,2) \notin S_1$.

If ϑ_0 is the arc $(1,1,1,2) \to (0,0,1,0)$ in Table 6, $P_0W_0P_5$ has the form as

$$(1,1,1,2) \to (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} .$$

Thus the vertices P_j for $j \geq 5$ are contained in S_2 by Lemma 6 (ii). So W_0 cannot be closed since $(1,1,1,2) \notin S_2$.

The above facts show that if ϑ_0 is any arc in Table 6 then the walk W_0 cannot be closed. Suppose that ϑ_0 satisfies $T(\vartheta_0) \in S_3$ and $H(\vartheta_0) \notin \Gamma$, i.e., those arcs in Table 7. By Lemma 7, we still have that the walk W_0 cannot be closed for any ϑ_0 given by Table 7. However, by (11) and the analysis therein, we have that W_0 is closed. This contradiction shows that the assumption at the beginning of the proof does not hold, and then the proof is finished. ■

Table 7: All arcs ϑ with $w(\vartheta) \geq 2$, $T(\vartheta) \in S_3$ and $H(\vartheta) \notin \Gamma$

$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$	$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$	$T(\vartheta)$	$H(\vartheta)$	$w(\vartheta)$
(1,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)	2	(0,1,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)	2	(0,0,1,0)	(0,1,0,0)	2
(1,0,1,1)	(1,0,0,0)	2	(1,0,1,1)	(0,1,0,0)	2	(1,0,1,1)	(0,0,1,0)	2
(1,1,0,1)	(1,0,0,0)	2	(1,1,0,1)	(0,1,0,0)	2	(1,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)	2
(0,1,1,1)	(1,0,0,0)	2	(0,1,1,1)	(0,1,0,0)	2	(0,1,1,1)	(0,0,1,0)	2

Remark 3: In the proof of Proposition 3, we do not distinguish whether the vertices of the walk W_0 are in the set $\{V_0, V_1, \cdots, V_{m-1}\}$ or not. That is to say, we have proven that each walk in $\mathcal{P}$ cannot be closed.

Proposition 4: For the integer sequence $\nu_0, \nu_1, \ldots, \nu_{m-1}$ of period m, if for any $\nu_i \geq 2$, there exists a positive integer $t \leq m$ such that $\nu_i + \nu_{i-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i-t+1} \leq t$, then $\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \nu_i \leq m$.

Proof: Let $I = \{i \,|\, \nu_i \geq 2\}$ and $|I| = p$. Thus, all elements of I can be listed as $i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_p$, where $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p$. For each integer $i_j \in I$, there exists a least positive integer t_j such that

$$\nu_{i_j} + \nu_{i_j-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i_j-t_j+1} \leq t_j, \tag{27}$$

and let $N_j = \{i_j, i_j - 1, \cdots, i_j - t_j + 1\}$ be a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_m$. Then the inequality (27) can be written as $\sum_{i \in N_j} \nu_i \leq t_j = |N_j|$. Let $N = \bigcup_{j=1}^{p} N_j$, and we have that $\nu_i \leq 1$ if $i \in \mathbb{Z}_m \setminus N$.

If $p = 1$, $\nu_{i_1} + \nu_{i_1-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i_1-t_1+1} \leq t_1$. In this case, the proof follows the fact that other ν_j satisfies $\nu_j \leq 1$.

If $p \geq 2$, we claim that for two integers j and j' with $1 \leq j < j' \leq p$, the sets N_j and $N_{j'}$ are disjoint or one containing another one. Without loss of generality, we take $j = 1$ and $j' = 2$. Then we have

$$\nu_{i_1} + \nu_{i_1-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i_1-t_1+1} \leq t_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu_{i_2} + \nu_{i_2-1} + \cdots + \nu_{i_2-t_2+1} \leq t_2, \tag{28}$$

respectively, where the subscripts are taken modulo m since the integer sequence has period m.

If the above claim is not true, then we have $i_1 - t_1 + 1 < i_2 - t_2 + 1 \leq i_1 < i_2$ and consider the following sequence

$$\nu_{i_1-t_1+1}, \cdots, \nu_{i_2-t_2+1}, \nu_{i_2-t_2+2}, \cdots, \nu_{i_1}, \cdots, \nu_{i_2}.$$

Notice that t_1 and t_2 are the least positive integers satisfying (28). Consequently, we have

$$\nu_{i_2-t_2+1} + \nu_{i_2-t_2+2} + \cdots + \nu_{i_1} > i_1 - i_2 + t_2, \text{ and } \nu_{i_1+1} + \nu_{i_1+2} + \cdots + \nu_{i_2} > i_2 - i_1.$$

This implies

$$\nu_{i_2-t_2+1} + \nu_{i_2-t_2+2} + \cdots + \nu_{i_1} + \nu_{i_1+1} + \nu_{i_1+2} + \cdots + \nu_{i_2} > t_2,$$

which contradicts with (28) and then the claim is true. Thus there exists a subset J of the set $\{1, 2, \cdots, p\}$ such that

$$N = \bigcup_{j \in J} N_j \quad \text{and} \quad N_j \bigcap N_{j'} = \emptyset \quad \text{for any two different elements } j \text{ and } j' \text{ of } J.$$

Thus $|N| = \sum_{j\in J} |N_j| = \sum_{j\in J} t_j$ and we have that

$$\sum_{i\in N} \nu_i = \sum_{j\in J} \sum_{i\in N_j} \nu_i \le \sum_{j\in J} t_j = |N|.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \nu_i = \sum_{i\in \mathbb{Z}_m \setminus N} \nu_i + \sum_{i\in N} \nu_i \le \sum_{i\in \mathbb{Z}_m \setminus N} 1 + |N| = m,$$

and this finishes the proof. ■

Propositions 3 and 4 tell us that $M(m; 3, 13) \le k$. Furthermore, we can also prove that the equal sign holds.

Lemma 8: (Theorem 14, [17]) We have that

$$M(m; 2^r + 1) = \begin{cases} m/2, & \text{if } m/(r, m) \text{ is even,} \\ (m - (m, r))/2, & \text{if } m/(r, m) \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Proof of Proposition 2: By Propositions 3 and 4, we have $w(\nu) \le m$ and then by (9)

$$M(m; 3, 13) = \max\left(w(s) - w(a) - w(b)\right) \le k$$

where the maximum is over all integers s, a, b such that

$$0 \le s, a, b \le 2^m - 1, \quad s \equiv 3a + 13b \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 2^m - 1), \quad a \text{ or } b \not\equiv 0 \,(\mathrm{mod}\, 2^m - 1).$$

On the other hand, we have $M(m; 3, 13) \ge M(m; 3)$ by the definition of $M(m; 3, 13)$. Applying Lemma 8, we have

$$k = (m - (m, r))/2 = M(m; 3) \le M(m; 3, 13) \le k.$$

Therefore, we have $M(m; 3, 13) = k$ and the proof is finished. ■

5 Concluding Remarks

For odd $m \ge 5$, a new triple-error-correcting cyclic code of length $2^m - 1$ has been found. It is defined by zeros α, α^3 and α^{13}, and the exponents 3 and 13 come from the Gold and Kasami-Welch APN power functions, respectively. To generalize the construction of the code $\mathcal{C}_{1,3,13}$, one can consider the class of cyclic codes $\mathcal{C}$ with the dual codes $\mathcal{C}^\perp$ having the form

$$\mathcal{C}^\perp = \left\{ \mathbf{c}(\epsilon, \gamma, \delta) = (\mathrm{Tr}_1^m(\epsilon x + \gamma f(x) + \delta g(x))_{x\in \mathbb{F}_{2^m}^*} \mid \epsilon,\, \gamma,\, \delta \in \mathbb{F}_{2^m} \right\}$$

where $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ are different APN functions from $\mathbb{F}_{2^m}$ to itself. If the polynomial $\mathrm{Tr}_1^m(\epsilon x + \gamma f(x) + \delta g(x))$ in variable x has algebraic degree greater than 2, some tools other than the theory of quadratic forms are possibly needed.

References

[1] E. Berlekamp, Algebraic Coding Theory, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.

[2] E. Berlekamp, The weight enumerators for certain subcodes of the second order binary Reed-Muller codes, Inf. Contr., vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 485-500, 1970.

[3] E. Berlekamp, Weight enumeration theorems, in Proc. Sixth Allerton Conf. Circuit and Systems Theory, Urbana, IL, pp. 161-170, 1968.

[4] T. Beth and C. Ding, On almost perfect nonlinear permutations, in Advances in Cryptography-EUROCRYPT'93, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 765, Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, pp. 65-76, 1994.

[5] J. Bondy and U. Murty, Graph Theory, Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2008.

[6] R. Bose and D. Ray-Chaudhuri, On a class of error correcting binary group codes, Inf. Contr., vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 68-79, 1960.

[7] K. Browning, J. Dillon, R.E. Kibler and M. McQuistan, APN polynomials and related codes, to appear in a special volume of J. Combin. Inform. System Sci., 2008, in press; honoring the 75th birthday of Prof. D.K. Ray-Chaudhuri.

[8] C. Carlet, On almost perfect nonlinear functions, IEICE Trans. Fundamental., vol. E91-A, no. 12, pp. 3665-3678, 2008.

[9] C. Carlet, P. Charpin and V. Zinoviev, Codes, bent functions, and permutations suitable for DES-like cryptosystems, Des. Codes Cryptogr., vol. 15, pp. 125-156, 1998.

[10] A. Chang, P. Gaal, S.W. Golomb, G. Gong, and P.V. Kumar, On a sequence conjectured to have ideal 2-level autocorrelation function, ISIT 1998, Cambridge.

[11] H. Dobbertin, Almost perfect nonlinear power functions on GF(2^n): the Niho case, Inform. and Comput., vol. 151, no. 1-2, pp. 57-72, 1999.

[12] H. Dobbertin, Almost perfect nonlinear power functions on GF(2^n): the Welch case, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 1271-1275, 1999.

[13] H. Dobbertin, Almost perfect nonlinear power functions on GF(2^n): a new case for n divisible by 5, in Finite Fields and Applications (Augsburg, 1999), Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, pp. 113-121, 2001.

[14] R. Gold, Maximal recursive sequences with 3-valued cross-correlation functions, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 154-156, 1968.

[15] A. Hocquenghem, Codes correcteurs d'erreurs, *Chiffres* (Paris), 2, pp. 147-156, 1959.

[16] H. Hollmann and Q. Xiang, On binary cyclic codes with few weights, in Finite Fields and Applications (Augsburg, 1999), Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, pp. 251-275, 2001.

[17] H. Hollmann and Q. Xiang, A proof of the Welch and Niho conjectures on cross-correlations of binary m-sequences, Finite Fields Appl., vol.7, no. 2, pp. 253-286, 2001.

[18] X. Hou, Affinity of permutations of F_{2^n}, Discrete Applied Mathematics, vol. 154, no. 2, pp. 313-325, 2006.

[19] T. Kasami, Weight distributions of Bose-Chaudhuri-Hocquenghem codes, in Combinatorial Mathematics and Its Applications, R.C. Bose and T.A. Dowling, Eds. Chapel Hill, NC: Univ. North Carolina Press, pp. 335-357, 1969.

[20] T. Kasami, The weight emuerators for several classes of subcodes of the second order binary Reed-Muller codes, Inf. Contr., vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 369-394, 1971.

[21] R. Lidl and H. Niederreiter, Finite Fields, in Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, vol. 20, 1983.

[22] F. MacWilliams and N. Sloane, The Theory of Error-Correcting Codes, NorthHolland, Amsterdam, 1977.

[23] R. McEliece, On periodic sequence from GF(q), J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 80-91, 1971.

[24] Y. Niho, Multi-valued cross-correlation functions between two maximal linear recursive sequences, Ph.D. dissertation, Univ. of Southern Carlifornia, Los Angeles, 1972.

[25] K. Nyberg, Differentially uniform mappings for cryptography, in Advances in Cryptology-EUROCRYPT'93, Lecture Notes in Computer Science 765, Berlin, Germany: Springer-Verlag, pp. 55-64, 1994.

[26] T. Schaub, A linear complexity approach to cyclic codes, Ph.D. dissertation, Swiss Federal Ins. Technol., Zurich, Switzerland, 1988.

Appendix A: Some Arcs ϑ in $\mathbb{D}$

Appendix A gives all arcs ϑ with the tail $T(\vartheta)$ in the set

$$\Big\{(0,0,0,0),(0,0,0,1),(1,0,0,0),(1,0,0,1),(0,1,0,0),(0,1,0,1),(1,1,0,1),(1,1,0,2),(0,0,1,0),(0,0,1,1),(1,0,1,1),(1,0,1,2),(0,1,1,1),(0,1,1,2),(1,1,1,1),(1,1,1,2),(1,1,1,3)\Big\}$$

and head $H(\vartheta) \notin \Gamma$.

1. $T(\vartheta) = (0,0,0,0)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)	(0,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	0	-1	1	1	0	1

2. $T(\vartheta) = (0,0,0,1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,2)	(0,0,0,3)	(1,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,2)	(0,1,0,2)	(0,1,0,3)	(1,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-3	-4	-1	-2	-2	-3	0
$H(\vartheta)$	(1,1,0,2)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,0,1,2)	(1,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)	(0,1,1,2)	(1,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	-1	-2	0	0	-1	1

3. $T(\vartheta) = (1,0,0,0)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	1	2

4. $T(\vartheta) = (1,0,0,1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,1)	(0,0,0,2)	(1,0,0,0)	(1,0,0,1)	(0,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	-2	1	0	0
$H(\vartheta)$	(0,1,0,2)	(1,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	1	1	0	1

5. $T(\vartheta) = (0,1,0,0)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	1	2

6.$T(\vartheta) = (0,1,0,1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,1)	(0,0,0,2)	(1,0,0,0)	(1,0,0,1)	(0,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	-2	1	0	0
$H(\vartheta)$	(0,1,0,2)	(1,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	1	1	0	1

7. $T(\vartheta) = (1, 1, 0, 1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)	(0,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	1	0	2	2	1	2

8. $T(\vartheta) = (1, 1, 0, 2)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,2)	(0,0,0,3)	(1,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,2)	(0,1,0,2)	(0,1,0,3)	(1,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-2	-3	0	-1	-1	-2	1
$H(\vartheta)$	(1,1,0,2)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,0,1,2)	(1,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)	(0,1,1,2)	(1,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	0	0	-1	1	1	0	2

9. $T(\vartheta) = (0, 0, 1, 0)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	1	2

10. $T(\vartheta) = (0, 0, 1, 1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,1)	(0,0,0,2)	(1,0,0,0)	(1,0,0,1)	(0,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	-2	1	0	0
$H(\vartheta)$	(0,1,0,2)	(1,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	1	1	0	1

11. $T(\vartheta) = (1, 0, 1, 1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)	(0,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	1	0	2	2	1	2

12. $T(\vartheta) = (1, 0, 1, 2)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,2)	(0,0,0,3)	(1,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,2)	(0,1,0,2)	(0,1,0,3)	(1,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-2	-3	0	-1	-1	-2	1
$H(\vartheta)$	(1,1,0,2)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,0,1,2)	(1,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)	(0,1,1,2)	(1,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	0	0	-1	1	1	0	2

13. $T(\vartheta) = (0, 1, 1, 1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)	(0,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	1	0	2	2	1	2

14. $T(\vartheta) = (0, 1, 1, 2)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,2)	(0,0,0,3)	(1,0,0,1)	(1,0,0,2)	(0,1,0,2)	(0,1,0,3)	(1,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	-2	-3	0	-1	-1	-2	1
$H(\vartheta)$	(1,1,0,2)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,0,1,2)	(1,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)	(0,1,1,2)	(1,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	0	0	-1	1	1	0	2

15. $T(\vartheta) = (1, 1, 1, 1)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,0)	(0,1,0,0)
$w(\vartheta)$	2	3

16. $T(\vartheta) = (1, 1, 1, 2)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,1)	(0,0,0,2)	(1,0,0,0)	(1,0,0,1)	(0,1,0,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	0	-1	2	1	1
$H(\vartheta)$	(0,1,0,2)	(1,1,0,1)	(0,0,1,0)	(0,0,1,1)	(0,1,1,1)
$w(\vartheta)$	0	2	2	1	2

17. $T(\vartheta) = (1, 1, 1, 3)$.

$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,0,3)	(0,0,0,4)	(1,0,0,2)	(1,0,0,3)	(0,1,0,3)	(0,1,0,4)	(1,1,0,2)	(1,1,0,3)
$w(\vartheta)$	-3	-4	-1	-2	-2	-3	0	-1
$H(\vartheta)$	(0,0,1,2)	(0,0,1,3)	(1,0,1,1)	(1,0,1,2)	(0,1,1,2)	(0,1,1,3)	(1,1,1,1)	(1,1,1,2)
$w(\vartheta)$	-1	-2	1	0	0	-1	2	1

Appendix B: The Proof of Lemma 6

Proof: The proofs of Lemma 6 (i) and (ii) are contained in the proof of Lemma 6 (iii), so we only focus on the proof for (iii). Furthermore, the proof for the case $P_{j+1}(2) = 1$ and $\omega = -2$ is contained in that for the case $P_{j+1}(2) = 0$ and $\omega = -2$, thus we always assume that $P_{j+1}(2) = 0$ and $\omega = -2$ in the sequel. For the same reason as in Example 1, without loss of generality, we can also assume that the integer q is large enough.

Let ϑ_i denote the arc with the tail P_i and head P_{i+1} for each $i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, q-1\}$.

Since $P_{j+1}(2) = 0$ and $\omega = -2$, by $P_j = (0, 0, 0, 0)$ and Appendix A, we have $P_{j+1} \in \big\{(0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0)\big\}$. If $P_{j+1} = (0, 0, 0, 0)$, then $w(\vartheta_j) = 0$. By a similar analysis as in (15), we have $w(\vartheta_{j+1}) \geq -1$. Consequently, $P_j W P_{j+2}$ has the form as

$$(0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} \qquad (\Phi 1). \tag{29}$$

For $P_{j+1} \in \big\{(0, 0, 0, 1), (0, 0, 1, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0)\big\}$, by a similar analysis $P_j W P_{j+2}$ has other three possible forms as below.

$$(0, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} \begin{cases} (0, 0, 0, 1) \xrightarrow{(0,\,0)} & (\Phi 2) \\ (0, 0, 1, 0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} & (\Phi 3) \\ (1, 0, 0, 0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} & (\Phi 4). \end{cases}$$

In the case $(\Phi 1)$, $P_{j+2}(2) = 0$ and then by Appendix A, we have

$$P_{j+2} \in \Big\{(0,0,0,0), (0,0,0,1), (0,0,1,0), (1,0,0,0)\Big\}.$$

Since the weights of the arcs with the tail P_{j+1} and heads $(0,0,0,0)$, $(0,0,0,1)$, $(0,0,1,0)$, $(1,0,0,0)$ are 0, -1, 1, 1, respectively, there are four possible forms for P_jWP_{j+3} as

$$(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,0)} & (\Phi 1.1) \\ (0,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,\,1)} & (\Phi 1.2) \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} & (\Phi 1.3) \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} & (\Phi 1.4). \end{cases}$$

For the case $(\Phi 1.1)$, $P_{j+3}(2) = 0$ and $w(\vartheta_{j+2}) \geq 0$. So $P_{j+3} \in \big\{(0,0,0,0), (1,0,0,0), (0,0,1,0)\big\}$ by Appendix A. When $P_{j+3} = (0,0,0,0)$, we have $w(\vartheta_{j+2}) = 0$ and $w(\vartheta_{j+3}) \geq 0+1-w(\vartheta_{j+2}) = 1$. By Example 1, in the case $(\Phi 1.1)$ and $P_{j+3} = (0,0,0,0)$, all vertices P_l $(j+1 \leq l \leq q)$ occurring in the walk W are contained in the set $\{(0,0,0,0), (1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0), (0,0,1,0)\}$, which is a subset of S_1. When $P_{j+3} = (1,0,0,0)$, by a similar analysis $P_{j+3}WP_{j+5}$ has the form

$$(1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,0)}.$$

When $P_{j+3} = (0,0,1,0)$, $P_{j+3}WP_{j+7}$ has three possible forms

$$(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,\,0)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,\,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,1)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,1)} \end{cases} \\ (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,0)}. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, for the case $(\Phi 1.1)$, $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)}$ has an SBS as

$$(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \begin{cases} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \xrightarrow{(0,\,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,\,1)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \end{cases} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \end{cases} \\ (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \end{cases} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)}, \end{cases} \tag{30}$$

in which all vertices and arcs in $P_{j+2}WP_q$ have occurred for the case $P_{j+2} = (0,0,0,0)$. Thus, all vertices P_l $(j+1 \leq l \leq q)$ occurring in the walk W are contained in the set S_1 defined by

(21). Furthermore, by (30), all walks with the form $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(\eta,\omega)}$ for $\eta \in \{0,1\}$ and $\omega \in \{0,1\}$ have occurred in (30). This finishes the proof of Lemma 6 (i).

For the case (Φ1.2), by Appendix A, we have $(0,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} O$, i.e., $q = j+2$ and $P_{j+2} = P_q$.

For the case (Φ1.3), $P_{j+2}WP_{j+6}$ has five possible forms as

$$(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,-1)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} & (\Phi 1.3.1) \\ (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} & (\Phi 1.3.2) \\ (0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} & (\Phi 1.3.3) \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} & (\Phi 1.3.4) \\ (1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} & (\Phi 1.3.5). \end{cases} \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

The walks $(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)}$ in (Φ1.3.2) and $(1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)}$ in (Φ1.3.4) have occurred in (30). We need to further analyze the cases (Φ1.3.3) and (Φ1.3.5). By Appendix A, $(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \end{cases} \tag{32}$$

for the case (Φ1.3.3) and $(1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

for the case (Φ1.3.5).

For the case (Φ1.4), $P_{j+2}WP_{j+4}$ is given by

$$(1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}.$$

Notice that the walk $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}$ in (Φ1.3.1), (Φ1.3.3) and (Φ1.4) has occurred as $P_{j+1}WP_{j+2}$ in (29). Therefore, by the above analysis for (Φ1.1)-(Φ1.4) and Lemma 6 (i), in the case that P_jWP_{j+2} has the form as (29), all vertices P_l $(j+1 \le l \le q)$ occurring in the walk W are contained in the set S_2 defined by (22). Furthermore, the walks $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(\eta,-1)}$ for $\eta \in \{0,1\}$ have occurred in (31). This finishes the proof of Lemma 6 (ii).

For the case ($\Phi 2$), $(0,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (1,0,1,1)$ has an SBS as

$$(0,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (1,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,-1)} (0,1,0,0) \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}. \end{cases}$$

For the case ($\Phi 3$), $P_{j+1}WP_{j+5}$ has six possible forms as

$$(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,-2)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} & (\Phi 3.1) \\ (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} & (\Phi 3.2) \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} & (\Phi 3.3) \\ (0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} & (\Phi 3.4) \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} & (\Phi 3.5) \\ (1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} & (\Phi 3.6). \end{cases} \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

The walk $(0,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ in ($\Phi 3.2$) has occurred as $P_{j+2}WP_{j+3}$ in ($\Phi 1.2$). For the case ($\Phi 3.3$), since the segment $P_{j+4}WP_{j+5}$ has the form $(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}$, the segment $P_{j+4}WP_{j+6}$ has the form $(0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,-1)}$. By Lemma 6 (ii), for the cases ($\Phi 3.2$) and ($\Phi 3.3$), all vertices in W are contained in the set S_2.

For the case ($\Phi 3.4$), $(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)}$ has an SBS as

$$(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,-1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} & (\Phi 3.4.1) \\ (0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} & (\Phi 3.4.2) \\ (0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} & (\Phi 3.4.3) \end{cases} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} & (\Phi 3.4.4) \\ (1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} & (\Phi 3.4.5) \\ (1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} & (\Phi 3.4.6). \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

For the case ($\Phi 3.4.2$), $(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \\ (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \end{cases}$$

and the walk $(0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ has occurred in (30). For the case ($\Phi 3.4.3$), $P_{j+5}WP_{j+9}$ has three

possible forms as

$$(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} (0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} & (\Phi 3.4.3.1) \\ (0,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \begin{cases} (0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} & (\Phi 3.4.3.2) \\ (1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} & (\Phi 3.4.3.3). \end{cases} \end{cases}$$

Since the walk $(0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}$ in the case (Φ3.4.3.1) has occurred in the case (Φ1.3.1) as (31), we need to further analyze the cases (Φ3.4.3.2) and (Φ3.4.3.3). $(0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,1)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,-1)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} (0,1,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

for (Φ3.4.3.2), and $(1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ has an SBS as

$$(1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \begin{cases} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

for (Φ3.4.3.3).

Notice that the walk $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}$ in (Φ3.4.4) has occurred in (Φ1) and the walks $(0,1,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ in (Φ3.4.5) and $(1,1,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ in (Φ3.4.6) have been analyzed in (35) and (36), respectively.

For the case (Φ3.5), $P_{j+4}WP_{j+6}$ has the form as $(1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-1)}$ and for the case (Φ3.6), $(1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)}$ has an SBS as

$$(1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \begin{cases} (0,0,1,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(1,0)} \\ (0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} \\ (1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,0)} \\ (1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)} . \end{cases}$$

Notice that the walks $(0,0,1,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ and $(1,0,0,1) \xrightarrow{(0,1)}$ have been analyzed in (32) and (33), respectively.

For the case (Φ4), the segment $P_{j+1}WP_{j+3}$ has the form $(1,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)} (0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)}$.

Notice that the walk $(0,0,0,0) \xrightarrow{(0,-2)}$ in the cases (Φ2), (Φ3.1), (Φ3.4.1), (Φ3.4.3.2), (Φ3.4.5), and (Φ4) has occurred as P_jWP_{j+1}. Therefore, combining the above analysis for the cases (Φ2)-(Φ4) and by Lemma 6 (i), (ii), all vertices P_l $(j+1 \leq l \leq q)$ occurring in the walk W are

contained in the set S_3. The proof for the case $\eta = 1$ and $\omega = -2$ is contained in the analysis of the case ($\Phi 3$) in (34). This finishes the proof of Lemma 6 (iii). ■